

**PECFA number:** 53212-3865-16  
**BRRTS number:** 03-41-000162  
**Site Name:** Brewery Works Inc.  
**Site Address:** 1616 N. 4<sup>th</sup> St. Milwaukee, WI 53212

**Program contact:** Greg Michael, Site Review Hydrogeologist  
**Program contact address:** 101 W. Pleasant St., Suite 205, Milwaukee, WI 53212  
**Program contact phone:** 414-220-5375

### **Submitted Questions and Responses**

1.) The former UST locations are not shown on the figures that are included in the "Supplemental Site Investigation Report". Where were the tanks located?

**The Supplemental Site Investigation Report is the complete documentation provided to the Department of Commerce with the exception of the remedial action plan. The Department has no further information than what is contained within the supplemental SIR.**

2.) Contaminant mass reduction is listed as "Not an available option for site closure" on the bid document. Will the successful bidder be required to remediate soils to NR720 default standards in order to achieve site closure?

**The contaminant mass reduction is not correlated to soil standards. Contaminant mass reduction is used when the Department expects a site to reach the maximum allowable funding from the PECFA program before site closure. Therefore, a percentage of mass reduction versus dollars spent would be used as an evaluatory tool for selection of a winning bidder.**

**The WDNR project manager did not require any specific clean up level for this site.**

3.) What is the nature of the contamination, gasoline or diesel?

**The consultant did not specify the nature of the contamination. According to the Department of Commerce Tank Storage database the following tanks have been reported at the site address: Diesel 5000 gals. Unleaded Gasoline 6000 gals. Leaded Gasoline 6000 gals. All the tanks have been reported as closed/removed. The Department is unaware if there are additional unreported tanks on the property.**

5.) What is the estimated contaminant mass?

**1,920 Kilograms in soil and dissolved within the groundwater. This estimate is based on TPH and VOC analysis conducted at the site. This estimate does not include free product identified in the vicinity of MW-6. The method used by the consultant for calculating this value was not included within the report.**

6.) Where was the free product identified?

**Free product is present in MW-6 and is suspected to exist in other areas near the former tank excavation.**

7.) How thick is the observed free product layer?

**According to the McLaren Hart Supplemental Site Investigation and Remedial Options Evaluation Report, dated September 1998, a maximum of 14,000 gallons of oil is recoverable. (This portion of the report was not duplicated due to the remedial options evaluation and cost analysis contained within this section of the report.) The method used by the consultant for calculating this value was not included within the report.**

8.) How many product thickness measurements have been collected?

**That information has not been provided to the Department.**

9.) Is the extent of contamination defined to the satisfaction of commerce and the DNR?

**The WDNR did not require any additional investigatory activities for this site. If the agency with administrative authority (WDNR) for this site had required additional site investigation activities to be conducted, Commerce would have removed the site from the public bid process. The following is copied directly from the WDNR case manager's letter on the subject site: " Based upon my review of the case file, it is my opinion that additional investigation would only be of limited benefit and is not practical at this time. However, if in the future, additional monitoring data indicates that the free product or groundwater contamination appears to be migrating or is more extensive than currently known, additional investigation would be warranted at that time." (Andy Boettcher, WDNR, July 28, 1999)**

10.) To what is the presence of the carbon tetrachloride attributed?

**Neither the Department of Commerce nor the WDNR have expressed a written opinion on the presence and source of the carbon tetrachloride.**

11.) McLaren Hart's Supplemental SI and Remedial Options, March 16, 1998 and Supplemental SI and Remedial Options, September 17, 1998 due *[sic]* not have much data regarding the shallow soil or groundwater. Is there shallow soil boring data in the SI report that was not provided for the bid copying?

**No.**

12.) The figures depicting the soil and groundwater analytical results are unreadable. This makes it very time consuming to evaluate the extent of the impacts.

**Icon Office Solutions has contacted the Department of Commerce about the quality of the report reproduction. Please contact Icon for new reproductions of the site maps and figures.**

13.) Where is the source area? Tank locations?

**Unknown (See question 1).**

14.) No figure depicting groundwater flow direction or plume.

**Correct (See question 1).**

15.) Is the downgradient extent defined in shallow groundwater, deep groundwater? Is the vertical extent defined?

**The WDNR did not require any additional investigatory activities on this site (see question 9).**

16.) Explain the groundwater results at MW6 for April 22, 1997; low PVOCs in groundwater analysis when there is 3.99 ft of product?

**Curious.**

17.) Where are the soil boring log and well log for MW06? What soil types and depths are present at MW6?

**That information was not made available to the Department of Commerce.**

18.) Has the WDNR requested additional wells be installed to determine the lateral extent of free product found in MW-6?

**See question 9.**

19.) Does the WDNR concur with McLaren/Hart that soil and groundwater contamination exceeding clean-up criteria is confined to the property boundary?

**The WDNR did not provide an opinion on lateral or vertical extent of contamination.**

20.) Section four of the bid request document indicates free product abatement must be covered in the bid response. The Supplemental Site investigation and Remedial Options Evaluation Report, dated September 17, 1998 and prepared by McLaren/Hart,

appears to have some information pertaining to free product recovery in Table 5, Part A. This table was not included in the information received from DCOM, and is not on file at the WDNR. Since this information may be pertinent to evaluate an appropriate remedial action to address free product abatement, it should be supplied to the bidders.

**Table 5A contains a list of the tasks for the remedial project. Included in the list is the budgeted hours, the rate budgeted, sub-cost, and total cost, for each task. The table has no additional information needed for the development of a bid.**